

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 365

HE 017 171

AUTHOR Eash, Maurice J.; Lane, John J.
TITLE Faculty Development: A Study of Constraints and Opportunities for Faculties and Institutions of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Board of Higher Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Consultation Programs; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Private Colleges; *Professional Development; *Program Development; *Retraining; State Colleges; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Exchange Programs; Two Year Colleges; Universities

ABSTRACT

In order to promote faculty development, the potential for sharing faculty resources among Illinois private and public institutions was studied. Three institutions were assessed: a comprehensive graduate-level public university, a comprehensive graduate-level private university, and a public community college. Faculty development activities that involve sharing of faculty resources among institutions were defined under four constructs: exchange, retraining, updating, and individual professional growth. Questionnaires were developed, pretested, and administered to 12 faculty from each institution. Interviews were also conducted with three administrators and five faculty from each of the three institutions. In addition, a sample of six institutions with different characteristics was studied to cross validate the sample. A second study was also initiated to investigate sharing personnel among business, industries, government agencies and nonprofit private agencies. Administrators of the two senior institutions saw no institutional policy or legal constraints to a faculty exchange program conducted between colleges and universities, while the community college administrators viewed the union contract governing wages and working conditions as a major consideration. The views of faculty respondents and additional findings are considered. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED243365

Faculty Development: A Study of Constraints and Opportunities
for Faculties and Institutions of Higher Education*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maurice J. Eash
Eash

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Maurice J. Eash
Professor of Urban Education Research
University of Illinois at Chicago

John J. Lane
Associate Professor
DePaul University

* The authors wish to acknowledge Jane Coffey of University of Illinois at Chicago for her continuing able assistance in preparation of this paper and the carrying out of the study. Lloyd Gillet of Wilbur Wright Community College added materially in the design and execution of the study. Tunis Dekker of University of Illinois at Chicago made an important contribution to data gathering in the original study.

Funding for the study was provided by the Illinois Board of Higher Education under the Higher Education Cooperative Act.

Presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association
April 20-27, 1984, New Orleans, Louisiana

I. Introduction

Higher education is faced with a dual problem of imbalance of resources among institutions and an increasing restrictiveness in purchase of resources to carry out the mandates of training and development of educated manpower, both regionally and nationally. At the same time there is a need to employ fully the faculty of some institutions of higher education as the demand for undergraduate and graduate education responds to volatility in enrollment and different demand pressures at the various levels of higher education in the state both in the public and private sectors. A working arrangement whereby faculty resources would be shared among institutions for purposes of alleviating faculty shortages in programs or developing new programs without employment of new faculty, provides opportunity for faculty to work in a new environment or develop new skills. The model if implemented could permit institutions to continue in a time of budget restrictiveness the necessary program development that is essential to maintain viable institutions of higher education. Thus a model for sharing faculty resources should meet both the demands of the institution and the demands of the individual faculty member which have the common requirement inasmuch as they both need to have continuous developmental activity in order to maintain their vitality.

The retraining or revitalization of faculty thru external experiences is inhibited at a time of budget stringency. More severe restrictions on sabbaticals, the limits of development grants and the place-bound constraints on mature faculty are but a few of the problems that are surfaced when faculty sharing is discussed. There is also a need for programs to

have an infusion of new blood that can be provided by bringing in new faculty thru an exchange as renewal agents for the permanent faculty.

The purpose of this study was to investigate ways to meet the needs of institutions and individual faculty members through a faculty development program that shares faculty resources among institutions. Sharing faculty resources holds potential for more efficient use of faculty and for meeting the goal of maintaining a stimulating, educational, intellectual environment in institutions of higher education that are unable at a time of budget constraint to continue the practice of the past of inducing program change and stimulation through the addition of new faculty talent.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education awarded a grant to their Faculty Advisory Committee, who represent the faculties of the public and private community colleges, colleges and businesses in the state, to study and plan a statewide model for sharing faculty resources among private and public institutions. Faculty sharing of resources was to be studied within the context of declining enrollments and the need to shift resources due to the change in student demand for academic majors.

Adjustment among institutions of faculty resources is more difficult than adjustment within institutions though the latter frequently pose no easy problems given the autonomy of instructional units in colleges and universities. The problem of sharing faculty resources, though identified by representatives to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, continued to be vague and undefined. There was limited experience in institutions and little practice on which to base judgments of how a program of faculty sharing would work especially as it

related to individual and institutional faculty development plans.

Drawing upon the Faculty Advisory Committee's deliberations across a span of two years, a proposal was drawn up which would use three institutions as a sample for study and subsequently to determine if from these data a plan could be suggested which might be further tested in the state. The three institutions were selected as representing three different levels of institutions of higher education, a comprehensive graduate degree granting public university, a comprehensive graduate degree granting private university and a public community college.

Four objectives were drawn to guide the study:

1. The investigation will assess the needs among institutions for exchange of faculty resources for the purposes of program development and faculty development.
2. The investigation will explore the level of institutional interest in a program whereby faculty resources would be shared over long term and short term commitments for program stimulation, faculty retraining, and program development.
3. The investigation will identify and appraise the mechanisms and regulations which encourage or inhibit interinstitutional cooperation in faculty exchange.
4. As a result of their investigations, the investigators will prepare a plan for faculty exchange, describe coordinating bodies, and different levels of exchange for use of shared resources among institutions and the development of faculty.

II. Method

An ERIC literature search was conducted but little empirical research on faculty sharing or faculty development was located, and nothing that paralleled this investigation.

To guide the investigation, faculty development activities which involve sharing of faculty resources among institutions were defined under four constructs: exchange, retraining, updating, and individual professional growth. The following specific definitions were adhered to in the study:

Faculty Exchange: Moving faculty members from one institution to another for purposes of relieving an excess of faculty or augmenting faculty where there is shortage.

Faculty Retraining: Faculty in one academic area would be trained in other areas where there is a need.

Faculty Updating: Faculty would study at another institution to acquire new knowledge, develop advanced teaching and research skills in their specific discipline.

Individual Professional Growth:

Faculty would leave home institution on sabbatical and study at another institution which would include time for research, review of current literature, attendance at seminars, tutorial session with faculty.

Interviews and questionnaires were constructed around these four constructs to determine constraints and incentives for faculty development among institutions through faculty sharing. As defined the four constructs represented higher levels of commitment from individuals and greater opportunity or sacrifice depending on the person's perspective.

After pilot testing questionnaires and interview guides, three administrators and five faculty from each of the three institutions were interviewed. Twenty faculty from each institution were administered questionnaires. To check the data in wider institutional settings a draft of the report was circulated to chief academic officers at six institutions. Attention was given in this circulation to include schools that were different on institutional characteristics from those in the study. The six institutions where the report was read included two public community colleges, one public university, and three private institutions. The two community colleges were public institutions, the one public institution was a graduate degree granting institution and in the three private colleges one was graduate degree granting and the other two were four-year small liberal arts colleges. The academic officer was asked to read the draft report and to comment on how he felt it reflected his institution--on needs and problems in the four areas of exchange, retraining, updating, professional growth. These results are contained in section VI of this paper. Originally the first study was to provide data to develop a model for faculty sharing among institutions of higher education. However, a rising concern for stimulating economic development in the state expanded the second study to include sharing personnel among

businesses, industries, government agencies and nonprofit private agencies. This second study is being conducted in FY1984 and preliminary findings are also reported in section VIII.

III. Administrators' Interviews

Interviews were conducted with three academic officers in each institution. These academic officers included the chief officer plus two others who were involved at lower levels but above the department level. When asked to list areas of surpluses and shortages, the administrators identified the following areas in their institutions:

Surpluses

Education

Geography

History

Humanities

Modern Languages

Music & Literature

Shortages

Accounting

Business

Commerce

Computer Science

Engineering

Finance

Marketing

Mathematics

Modern Languages

Physical Science

The administrators' perception of the relative importance of the four areas investigated in this study varied somewhat among the three institutions. These differences are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Ratings of Perceived Need for Faculty Development by Administrators (N=9)

<u>Area</u>	<u>Senior Public U.</u>	<u>Senior Private U.</u>	<u>Public Community College</u>	<u>$\bar{x}$</u>
Faculty Exchange	3	3	1.5	2.5
Retraining	3	2.6	1.5	2.36
Updating	3	2.3	4	3.1
Professional Growth	0	2	3.5	1.83

1 -- High

4 -- Low

Faculty Exchange

Administrative officers of the two senior institutions saw no institutional policy or legal constraints to a faculty exchange program conducted between colleges and universities while the community college administrators viewed the union contract governing wages and working conditions as a major consideration in any exchange program.

Other additional constraints mentioned by the administrators were, need for additional compensation, institutional differences in faculty load, semester vs. quarter hours system, the change in perceived statuses in movement between 2-year and senior institutions, differences among institutions in purpose, history, organizational structure and orientation to research.

The Administrators saw as major incentives to an exchange program the provision of new experiences through allowing a change of environment when

faculty mobility is reduced, contact with a new student body with different interests, expanding opportunity to teach one's specialty, broadening the scope of an institution's programs at reduced cost, encouraging interdisciplinary studies and research, improving urban studies, breaking down interuniversity barriers, and improving perceptions of the problem of articulation between 2-year and senior institutions.

Retraining

In the area of retraining the two senior institutions saw no policy or legal constraints, and the community college administrators once again viewed the union contract as a major consideration. Administrative recognition of retraining, as being a major or even drastic step, gave rise to frequent references to possible psychological restraints for faculty. Hence, they expressed the need for any program to be well thought out and designed with dual attention to the best interests of the faculty and the institution. If retraining is to be successful the faculty will need to be given psychological support especially during retraining that affects the disciplinary field. The main incentives to encourage faculty to participate in retraining were assurance (to the faculty) of an academic position after undergoing retraining, financial rewards, both during retraining (sabbatical, tuition reimbursement) and afterwards (credit for the new training toward salary advancement or promotion), and not being penalized for failure to maintain publications, committee involvement, or other service commitments during the retraining period. If retraining required moving, the corresponding financial incentives would need to be increased.

Updating

In their responses concerning "updating," all administrators listed constraints and incentives that were virtually identical to those given for the construct "retraining." The majority of administrators seemed to be concerned with the sensitive personal issues that can arise from such a program exemplified in the response of one administrator who said, "Do we tell someone they need this?" and "How do we send our deadwood for retraining?"

Individual Professional Growth

The administrators saw no policy or legal constraints and viewed professional growth as a long standing program in higher education which was routine, except that it had become more restricted with budget tightening. The incentives needed revolve around financial remuneration. Administrators also frequently mentioned that activities in this construct should include non-traditional settings, e.g., government research centers and museums. Because of their familiarity with this form of faculty development they had few comments.

IV. Faculty Interviews

Five faculty from each institution were identified and interviewed along the same lines as the administrators. These faculty were selected from a list suggested by the chief academic officer and met the criteria of the investigators as being faculty who had a broad working knowledge of the institution, its programs and faculty. Faculty members were asked to identify disciplines where there were surpluses and shortages.

There was general agreement among the respondents from the two

universities that shortages exist in the areas of accounting, business and commerce, computer science and technology, and engineering where only the public university had a program. Community college respondents identified shortages as occurring in English as a second language, journalism, reading specialists, and mathematics. All respondents were in agreement that surplus faculty existed in history, languages, classics, and geography.

The faculty's perception of the relative importance of the four areas of faculty development investigated in this study varied somewhat among the three institutions. These differences are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Ratings of Perceived Need for Faculty Development by Faculty (N=15)

<u>Area</u>	<u>Senior Public U.</u>	<u>Senior Private U.</u>	<u>Public Community College</u>	<u>$\bar{X}$ (by construct)</u>
Faculty Exchange	3.5	2.6	3.4	3.16
Retraining	3.5	2.4	3.0	2.96
Updating	3.5	1.9	2.6	2.66
Professional Growth	3.5	1.6	2.25	2.45
$\bar{X}$ (by institution)	3.5	2.1	2.8	

1 = high
4 = low

Overall the private university rated somewhat higher on the perceived need for faculty development than did the public university or public community college. In the interviews the faculty provided data on each of the constructs. These data gathered under more specific probes than

ratings reflected somewhat different faculty attitudes.

Faculty Exchange

When queried about faculty shortages and surpluses as the basis for starting an exchange program, the faculty members tended to respond negatively. Such comments as, "there were no real surpluses or shortages, just a problem of the faculty talent not being properly use," and in another instance, "shortages and surpluses exist only when people take leave." But there was expressed in one institution the belief that qualified representatives from other institutions would benefit from their specialized resources.

The constraints faculty felt that would hamper the adoption of an exchange program were financial support, tenure and seniority in their own institution, quantitative differences of faculty, department autonomy, jeopardy of committee responsibilities, change in lifestyle (rural vs. urban; residential vs. commuter), union problems, and salary considerations (overload pay, advancements).

The community college faculty raised as a constraint the status differences which might come into play in an exchange program at universities and the differences in load assignment especially in teaching being far heavier at the community college versus the lighter teaching load in the universities.

University faculty thought that differences in purpose, research orientation, size of institution, possible violation of accreditation standards, and promotion policies would be influential constraints in a direct exchange of faculty with another institution, especially a commu-

nity college.

There was general consensus among the three types of schools that an exchange would be visualized by faculty members as a beneficial move to both the institution and individual because: it could develop positive collegial relationships, afford an opportunity to teach advanced courses, engage more actively in research, expand the the range of library resources, encourage intellectual dialogue, attune community college faculty to the demands of the bachelor's degree, possibly find new job opportunities, rebuild reputations, and afford summer work.

Retraining

On matters of retraining there was general receptiveness. Community college respondents thought that selected faculty could be retrained to teach English as a second language and become reading specialists. Retraining was also looked upon as a help to devising new approaches to long standing instructional problems. It was felt that people with quantitative skills might make relatively easy transitions as micro-computer specialists or a physicist retrained as an engineer.

No constraints were offered other than those already noted under exchange. The faculty stated that incentives for retraining are job preservation, flexibility in future assignments, salary increases, released time with pay, and payment of tuition.

Updating

For the faculty interviewed the area of updating had more appeal than an exchange program or retraining. The only constraints cited were those associated with travel and union contracts. Incentives conducive to

encourage faculty to participate in updating were released time at full pay and cost of education. If participation in the program was accompanied with the recognition that viewed it as carrying status and prestige, and avoided threatening advancement in rank and salary increases, it appeared faculty would participate in an updating program.

Professional Growth

It was generally agreed among those interviewed that professional growth is essential to academic life and the sabbatical leave policies meet this need. Faculty felt the process should be highly individualized and self-directed.

There were no barriers mentioned other than budget limitations which have increased and restricted faculty leaves.

Incentives identified as necessary for faculty to undertake professional growth activities in other institutions are promotion, merit raises, and opportunity for self-fulfillment. The community college interviewees cited the opportunity for a community college faculty to teach in a university as an incentive. Several respondents saw the potential in the experience for advancing collegiality as an incentive but hasten to point out that it could also have negative costs depending upon the match of institution and individual.

V. Faculty Questionnaires

As a cross check on the interview data which were gathered from the five faculty members in each institution and to enlarge the sampling of the faculty, a questionnaire was administered to twenty faculty members from each of the three participating institutions. These twenty faculty

members were drawn with attention given to obtaining representation from the three areas of humanities, sciences, and professional schools. Of the sample of 60, twenty-four were from the sciences, twenty-eight from the humanities, and eight from professional schools. Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents by academic disciplines among the three institutions.

Table 3

Number of Respondents in Sciences, Humanities,
and Professional Schools by Institution

	Science	Humanities	Professional Schools
Senior Private Univ.	10 (16.7%)	4 (6.7%)	6 (10.0%)
Senior Public Univ.	6 (10.0%)	12 (20.0%)	2 (3.3%)
Public Community College	<u>8</u> (13.3%)	<u>12</u> (20.0%)	<u>0</u> (0.0%)
Total	24 (40.0%)	28 (46.7%)	8 (13.3%)

The questionnaire paralleled the interview but solicited closed ended responses to statements in the four areas under consideration in faculty development.

Faculty were asked to react to questions concerning surplus faculty and shortages of faculty in their institutions and in their academic areas. The faculty did not perceive a surplus of faculty either in their institutions or in their academic disciplines. Only one of the three schools perceived a shortage of faculty and two of the three disciplinary areas perceived shortages, though by small margins (see Table 4). These responses differ somewhat from administrators' perceptions of surpluses and shortages, and one is led to ponder whether faculty are not well

Table 4
 Surplus and Shortages of Faculty Members
 As Perceived by Respondents in 3 Institutions (N=60)

	Shortages				Surplus			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Total	30	50.0	30	50.0	12	20.0	48	80.0
Senior Public University	14	70.0	6	30.0	4	20.0	16	80.0
Senior Private	7	35.0	13	65.0	4	20.0	16	80.0
Public Community College	9	45.0	11	55.0	4	20.0	16	80.0
	$\chi^2 = 5.20^a$				$\chi^2 = 0.00$			
Science	14	58.3	10	41.7	3	12.5	21	87.5
Humanities	11	39.3	17	60.7	7	25.0	21	75.0
Professional School	5	62.5	3	37.5	2	25.0	6	75.0
	$\chi^2 = 2.45$				$\chi^2 = 1.41$			
	ap $\leq .10$							

informed on the institutional and academic area needs of their institutions or whether they fail to recognize the current faculty needs in relationship to program for other reasons. The bulk of the questionnaire to faculty consisted of 15 items which addressed the four areas of faculty development, exchange, retraining, updating, and individual professional development. Table 5 lists the 15 items and presents all responses (N=60) on the five point scale. Table 6 presents overall ratings of items in each of the four areas by the three institutions. Table 7 carries the responses as they are rated by the faculty from the three different participating schools, and Table 8 presents the responses by academic area.

These responses, taken as a whole, do not show a strong enthusiasm for faculty development (see Table 5). The 15 items testing faculty sentiments at different levels of commitment (1, very important to me to 5, never important to me) found that most faculty responded that faculty development was seldom important to them. The next highest overall faculty response placed faculty development responses as sometimes important to them. The categories outer limits (1 and 5) found that never important (5) outdrew the category of very important (1) by the sizeable margin of 152 to 102. This finding indicates that the faculty are unenthusiastic about confronting the change which is involved in faculty development, despite the built-in conditions in the stimulus question to soften the impact on salary and adjustments in moving.

A further analysis of the data was done through examination according to the four areas of faculty development and these are seen in Tables 6, 7, and 8. This analysis does not give us quite the pessimistic view indicated

Table 5
Total Responses of Faculty in Three Institutions (N = 60)

	Very Important (1)	Important (2)	Sometimes Important (3)	Seldom Important (4)	Never Important (5)	N.A. (0)
1. To collaborate on problem research questions	11	6	15	19	6	3
2. To use equipment and other resources not available to me on my campus	10	11	15	18	5	1
3. To obtain insights regarding gaps in my existing knowledge	18	17	17	5	2	1
4. To test theories, hypotheses, and assumptions with new colleagues	10	17	13	14	4	2
5. To enhance intra institutional collegiality among people in my academic discipline	8	14	16	15	5	2
6. To benefit from an experience which enriches my storehouse of usable knowledge for teaching, research, and writing	16	23	12	5	3	1
7. To teach a new course in a different institution	3	13	13	22	8	1
8. To experiment with the application of knowledge to practical questions in different institution	4	13	13	21	8	1
9. To develop more comprehensive answers through further study to questions I encounter with undergraduate and graduate students	4	21	19	11	4	1
10. To experiment with teaching methods in another environment	5	9	17	23	5	1
11. To gain greater competency in another discipline	5	10	19	13	12	1
12. To locate data for a research project in another institution	6	8	13	19	13	1
13. To retest the practical application of a new procedure after developing and testing at home institution	2	6	15	20	16	1
14. To change my disciplinary competency (e.g. English to computer science)	0	5	10	18	26	1
15. To change my teaching field	0	3	10	11	35	1
TOTAL	102	176	217	234	152	19

Table 6

Overall Ratings on Faculty Development Areas
by Faculty (N = 60)

	Very Important	Important	Sometimes Important	Seldom Important	Never Important	N.A.
Exchange	1	2	3	4	5	0
Item #7	3	13	13	22	8	1
Item #8	4	13	13	21	8	1
Item #10	5	9	17	23	5	1
TOTAL	<u>12</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>3</u>
Retraining	1	2	3	4	5	0
Item #11	5	10	19	13	12	1
Item #14	0	5	10	18	26	1
Item #15	0	3	10	11	35	1
TOTAL	<u>5</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>3</u>
Upgrading	1	2	3	4	5	0
Item #2	10	11	15	18	5	1
Item #3	18	17	17	5	2	1
Item #4	10	17	13	14	4	2
Item #6	16	23	12	5	3	1
Item #9	4	21	19	11	4	1
Item #13	2	6	15	20	16	1
TOTAL	<u>60</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>7</u>
Professional Growth	1	2	3	4	5	0
Item #1	11	6	15	19	6	3
Item #5	8	14	16	15	5	2
Item #12	6	8	13	19	13	1
TOTAL	<u>25</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>6</u>
GRAND TOTAL	102	176	217	234	152	19

Table 7

Benefits in Faculty Exchange, Retraining, Updating and Individual Growth Programs: By Institution

	Senior Public University			Senior Private University			Public Community College			F
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	
<u>Exchange (TOTAL)</u>	3.35	0.74	20	3.00	1.02	19	3.47	1.04	20	1.29
To teach a new course in a different institution	3.60	0.99	20	2.84	1.12	19	3.50	1.15	20	2.77 ^a
To experiment with the application of knowledge to practical questions in a different institution	3.00	0.97	20	3.11	1.24	19	3.70	1.17	20	2.21
To experiment with teaching methods in another environment	3.45	0.89	20	3.05	1.13	19	3.20	1.24	20	0.66
<u>Retraining (TOTAL)</u>	4.08	0.72	20	3.75	0.99	19	3.87	1.05	20	0.63
To gain greater competency in another discipline	3.35	0.99	20	3.32	1.29	19	3.20	1.40	20	0.08
To change my disciplinary competency (e.g. English to computer science)	4.35	0.88	20	3.95	0.91	19	4.00	1.12	20	0.99
To change my teaching field	4.55	0.69	20	4.00	1.05	19	4.40	0.99	20	1.84
<u>Updating (TOTAL)</u>	2.58	0.77	20	2.58	0.58	19	3.19	0.92	20	4.11 ^a
To use equipment and other resources not available to me on my campus	2.60	1.19	20	2.63	1.21	19	3.60	1.10	20	4.72 ^a
To obtain insights regarding gaps in my existing knowledge	2.30	1.17	20	2.05	0.85	19	2.40	1.23	20	0.51
To test theories, hypotheses and assumptions with new colleagues	2.40	1.14	20	2.68	1.16	19	3.15	1.26	19	2.02
To benefit from an experience which enriches my storehouse of usable knowledge for teaching, research and writing	2.05	1.00	22	2.00	0.82	19	2.70	1.34	20	2.59 ^a
To develop more comprehensive answers through further study to questions I encounter with undergraduate and graduate students	2.70	1.13	20	2.42	0.61	19	3.35	1.09	20	4.68 ^{**}
To retest the practical application of a new procedure after developing and testing at home institution	3.45	1.10	20	3.68	0.95	19	4.00	1.17	20	1.31
<u>Individual Growth (TOTAL)</u>	2.58	1.01	20	2.83	0.83	19	3.94	0.68	20	14.38 ^{***}
To collaborate on problem research questions	2.40	1.27	20	2.78	1.17	18	4.00	0.82	19	11.03 ^{***}
To enhance intra institutional collegiality among people in my academic discipline	2.58	1.12	19	2.58	1.12	19	3.55	1.10	20	4.98 ^{**}
To locate data for a research project in another institution	2.80	1.36	20	3.16	1.17	19	4.30	0.66	20	10.09 ^{***}

Note: 1 = Very Important, 5 = Never Important

ap $\leq .10$
^ap $\leq .05$
^{**}p $\leq .01$
^{***}p $\leq .001$

Table 8
Benefits in Faculty Exchange, Retraining, Updating, and Individual Growth Programs:
Total and By Academic Area

	Total $\bar{X}$	S.D.	Science $\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	Humanities $\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	Prof. Schools $\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	F
<u>Exchange (TOTAL)</u>	3.28	0.95	3.61	0.87	23	3.13	0.97	28	2.83	0.85	8	2.78 ^a
To teach a new course in a different institution	3.32	1.12	3.61	1.12	23	3.21	1.07	28	2.87	1.25	8	1.55
To experiment with the application of knowledge to practical questions in a different institution	3.27	1.16	3.43	1.16	23	3.32	1.19	28	2.63	0.92	8	1.53
To experiment with teaching methods in another environment	3.24	1.09	3.78	0.85	23	2.86	1.11	28	3.00	1.07	8	5.54 ^{**}
<u>Retraining (TOTAL)</u>	3.90	0.92	4.10	0.99	23	3.76	0.89	28	3.83	0.85	8	0.87
To gain greater competency in another discipline	3.29	1.22	3.52	1.20	23	3.14	1.24	28	3.13	1.25	8	0.69
To change my disciplinary competency (e.g. English to computer science)	4.10	0.98	4.30	1.02	23	3.14	1.24	28	3.13	1.25	8	0.69
To change my teaching field	4.32	0.94	4.48	0.90	23	4.29	0.98	28	4.00	0.93	8	0.82
<u>Updating (TOTAL)</u>	2.79	0.79	2.95	0.74	23	2.83	0.86	28	2.17	0.63	8	3.02 ^a
To use equipment and other resources not available to me on my campus	2.95	1.24	2.87	1.29	23	3.11	1.23	28	2.63	1.19	8	0.54
To obtain insights regarding gaps in my existing knowledge	2.25	1.09	2.26	1.01	23	2.36	1.16	28	1.87	1.13	8	0.60
To test theories, hypotheses and assumptions with new colleagues	2.74	1.21	2.78	1.04	23	2.96	1.37	27	1.87	0.64	8	2.67 ^a
To benefit from an experience which enriches my storehouse of usable knowledge for teaching, research and writing	2.25	1.11	2.52	1.12	23	2.25	1.11	28	1.50	0.76	8	2.67 ^a
To develop more comprehensive answers through further study to questions I encounter with undergraduate and graduate students	2.83	1.04	3.30	1.11	23	2.64	0.91	28	2.13	0.64	8	5.44 ^{**}
To retest the practical application of a new procedure after developing and testing at home institution	3.71	1.08	3.96	1.15	23	3.71	1.05	28	3.00	0.76	8	2.43 ^a
<u>Individual Growth (TOTAL)</u>	3.12	1.03	3.36	0.97	23	3.19	1.03	28	2.20	0.73	8	4.28 ^a
To collaborate on problem research questions	3.05	1.29	3.04	1.33	23	3.35	1.20	26	2.13	1.13	8	2.94 ^a
To enhance intra institutional collegiality among people in my academic discipline	2.91	1.19	3.26	1.14	23	2.93	1.17	27	1.87	0.83	8	4.54 ^a
To locate data for a research project in another institution	3.42	1.26	3.78	1.24	23	3.36	1.28	28	2.63	0.92	8	2.72 ^a

Note: 1 = Very Important, 5 = Never Important
^ap ≤ .10
^{*}p ≤ .05
^{**}p ≤ .01

in the overall responses as it shows the faculty do have concern for upgrading their professional skills (see Table 6). Levels of significance were obtained on some items and overall faculty are saying that updating is important or has some importance to them (see Tables 7 and 8). Moreover, there is also recognition given to a need for professional growth even more strongly than upgrading (see Table 6). The faculty are least enthusiastic about faculty development options requiring the most change, retraining and exchange. Specifically, they are very negative to the idea of retraining. Correspondingly, they react negatively to the idea that they might be involved in an exchange of faculty notwithstanding the fact that institutions may be experiencing surpluses or shortages in their fields.

Tables 7, 8, and 9 break out the data by the three institutions, academic area, and faculty members' institution. Again these parallel, to a considerable extent, the overall response trends. There is more interest in updating by senior public university and senior private university faculty than by public community college and more interest in individual growth by senior public and senior private universities' faculty (see Table 10). This may reflect greater use by these faculty of sabbatical leaves and inter-institutional research.

Faculty were queried on what incentives would be necessary to enlist and encourage them to enter the exchange program. By a significant margin they chose the response no incentive, i.e., there is very little that would induce them to be exchange faculty, or they were not interested in considering entering into an exchange program (see Table 11). When they were asked what incentives would be necessary to enlist and encourage them

Table 9

Perceived Need By Institution and Academic Area for Faculty Development Programs

(Summary Table)

<u>Institutions</u>	Exchange			Retraining			Updating			Individual Growth		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
Senior Public Univ.	2.58	1.07	19	3.05	1.18	19	2.68	1.06	19	2.20	1.11	20
Senior Private Univ.	2.84	1.01	19	3.11	0.99	19	2.32	0.75	19	2.26	1.19	19
Public Community College	3.35	0.99	20	3.60	0.68	20	3.00	0.97	20	2.80	1.24	20
TOTAL	2.93	1.06	58	3.26	0.98	58	2.67	0.96	58	2.42	1.19	59
F	2.87 ^a			1.91			2.60 ^a			1.55		
<u>Academic Areas</u>												
Science	3.18	1.01	22	3.50	0.80	22	2.83	0.89	23	2.48	1.12	23
Humanities	2.82	1.09	28	3.07	1.05	28	2.67	1.04	27	2.50	1.29	28
Professional	2.63	1.06	8	3.25	1.17	8	2.25	0.89	8	2.00	1.07	8
F	0.34			1.18			1.07			0.58		

^ap ≤ .10

Note: 1 = High Need; 4 = Low Need

Table 10

Personal Interest in Programs

<u>By Institution</u>	<u>Exchange</u>			<u>Retraining</u>			<u>Updating</u>			<u>Professional Growth</u>		
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	N
Senior Public University	2.95	1.27	19	3.58	0.84	19	2.47	1.35	19	1.70	1.03	20
Senior Private University	2.56	1.15	18	3.28	1.02	18	2.11	1.10	19	1.68	1.16	19
Public Community College	2.85	1.31	20	3.65	0.75	20	2.95	1.06	20	2.45	1.36	20
Total	2.79	1.23	57	3.51	0.87	57	2.52	1.20	58	1.95	1.22	59
F	0.49			0.96			2.55 ^a			2.68 ^a		
<u>In Academic Area</u>												
Science	3.19	1.03	21	3.67	0.80	21	2.87	1.10	23	2.22	1.17	23
Humanities	2.43	1.32	28	3.39	0.96	28	2.33	1.27	27	1.82	1.31	28
Professional Schools	3.00	1.20	8	3.50	0.76	8	2.13	1.13	8	1.64	1.06	8
F	2.55 ^a			0.59			1.77			0.99		

^a $p \leq .10$

Note: 1 = High Interest, 4 = Low Interest

Table 11

Incentives That Would Enlist & Encourage You to Enter An Exchange Program

	Freq.	% of Responses	% of Cases
Comparable compensation	9	11.0	17.0
Interest in program, assignment, location	7	8.5	13.2
Reduced load, more compact schedule	6	7.3	11.3
Salary increase, travel reimbursement	5	6.1	9.4
Retention of status, seniority	4	4.9	7.5
Non-interference with family obligations, spouse, jobs	3	3.7	5.7
Convenient location, same city	3	3.7	5.7
Ability to return to home institution, job security	3	3.7	5.7
Opportunity for research, study	3	3.7	5.7
Threat of loss of job	2	2.4	3.8
Maintenance of benefits	2	2.4	3.8
Increased responsibility, leadership role	2	2.4	3.8
Quality of students	2	2.4	3.8
None, very little, not interested, not applicable	15	18.3	28.3
Other	<u>16</u>	<u>19.5</u>	<u>30.2</u>
Total Responses (N = 53)	82	100.0	154.7

to enter a retraining program, again 40 percent stated that they were not interested in entering into a retraining program (see Table 12). About 13 percent of the faculty stated that salary increase and travel reimbursement would be important elements in either choice to enter a retraining program.

For an updating program there was somewhat more interest (see Table 13). About 15 percent of respondents did report that opportunity for professional improvement and growth would be essential if they were to enter into an updating program. About 12 percent felt stipends and financial incentives were necessary and 10 percent felt that personal interest and a well designed program would be the chief incentives. There was not a predominance of response in the other categories.

When asked what incentives would be necessary to encourage you to enter into an individual growth program, again, there was a clustering in the categories of, "not interested," "maintenance of income would be essential," "paid leave" and by a slightly lower percent, "interest in the program" (see Table 14).

Faculty were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 4 their institution's needs for faculty development in the four areas. These are shown in Table 9 and 10. These data evidence modest recognition for the need for updating faculty in the institution and a stronger felt need for faculty professional growth. At this time in these faculties' perception, faculty retraining and the faculty exchange are largely rejected as faculty development alternatives. To differentiate between institutional and personal interests, the sample was again asked to rate on a four point

Table 12

Incentives that Would Enlist & Encourage You to Enter A Retraining Program

	Freq.	% of Responses	% of Cases
Salary increase, travel reimbursement, stipends	8	12.9	17.4
Interest in retraining topics, intellectual stimulation	5	8.1	10.9
Granting of sabbatical, paid leave	4	6.5	8.7
Reduced load, free-time, released time	4	6.5	8.7
Threat of loss of job, fired	2	3.2	4.3
Proof that I needed retraining	2	3.2	4.3
Availability of new materials, resources	2	3.2	4.3
Assurance of job security	2	3.2	4.3
None, not interested, not applicable	25	40.3	54.3
Other	<u>8</u>	<u>12.9</u>	<u>17.4</u>
	62	100.0	134.8
Total Responses (N = 46)			

Table 13

Incentives That Would Enlist & Encourage You to Enter an Updating Program

	Freq.	% of Responses	% of Cases
Opportunity for professional improvement, growth	10	14.9	21.3
Stipends, financial incentives	3	11.9	17.0
Interest in program, well designed program	7	10.4	14.9
Released time	6	9.0	12.8
Maintenance of income, benefits	6	9.0	12.8
Already involved in updating	5	7.5	10.6
Granting of sabbatical, paid leave	4	6.0	8.5
Job security	4	6.0	8.5
Qualified experts do updating	4	4.5	6.4
None, not interested, not applicable	6	9.0	12.8
Other	<u>8</u>	<u>11.9</u>	<u>17.0</u>
	68	100.0	142.6
Total Responses (n = 47)			

Table 14
Incentives that Would Enlist & Encourage You to Enter
an Individual Growth Program

	Freq.	% of Responses	% of Cases
Granting of sabbatical, paid leave	9	13.4	18.4
Maintenance of income, benefits	9	13.4	18.4
Interest in program, well designed program	7	10.4	14.3
Released time	6	9.0	12.2
Job security, retention of job status	5	7.5	10.2
Stipends, tuition & expenses reimbursement	3	4.5	6.1
Already involved in such a program	2	3.0	4.1
Salary increase, financial incentives	2	3.0	4.1
None, not interested, not applicable	9	13.4	18.4
Other	<u>15</u>	<u>22.4</u>	<u>30.6</u>
Total Responses (N = 49)	67	100.0	136.7

scale faculty development as a personal concern in the four areas (Table 10). In personal interests the only area of faculty development to achieve recognition in a positive direction is the area of professional growth. This is understandable, we believe, inasmuch as personal growth follows the traditional pattern of faculty conduct as they exercise sabbatical privileges and pursue disciplinary interests through this mechanism. There was a high rate of rejection for faculty development through the routes of exchange or retraining which require the most drastic readjustment for faculty but may be the most significant for the institution. There were some differences in perceptions by the three faculties with the community college faculty perceiving less need for faculty development than did the senior university faculties. Faculty were asked about the receptivity of their departments to exchange faculty from other institutions. Most faculty felt they and their departments would receive an exchange faculty member favorably (see Table 15). Only 7 percent of the total sample reported that exchange faculty would be received unfavorably, and there were no differences by institution. However, many faculty qualified their favorable responses by adding that the person should "meet department standards," "be needed by the department," or "be a benefit to the department" (see Table 15).

VI. Cross Validation of the Sample

To guard against bias due to special institutional characteristics of the three institutions in the study, e.g., large institutions and urban locations, a sample of six other institutions with different characteristics was drawn to cross validate the sample. These six institutions

Table 15

How Your Department Would Receive An Exchange Faculty Member

	Total			Senior Public University			Senior Private University			Public Community College		
	Freq.	% of Resp.	% of Cases	Freq.	% of Resp.	% of Cases	Freq.	% of Resp.	% of Cases	Freq.	% of Resp.	% of Cases
Very favorably, warmly	33	50.8	56.9	12	60.0	60.0	7	38.9	38.9	14	51.9	70.0
Favorably if person was needed or could benefit department	10	15.4	17.2	2	10.0	10.0	6	33.3	33.3	2	7.4	10.0
Favorably if person met department standards	8	12.3	13.8	2	10.0	10.0	2	11.1	11.1	4	14.8	20.0
Favorably, opportunity for our faculty to learn from exchange person	3	4.6	5.2	1	5.0	5.0	0	-	-	2	7.4	10.0
Curiously	2	3.1	3.4	0	-	-	0	-	-	2	7.4	10.0
Not favorably	4	6.2	6.9	1	5.0	5.0	1	5.6	5.6	2	7.4	10.0
Other	<u>5</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>8.6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>5.0</u>
Total Responses (N = 58)	65	100.0	112.1	20	100.0	100.0	18	100.0	100.0	27	100.0	135.0

are located outside the City of Chicago and reflected different institutional characteristics. Two were public community colleges, two were private liberal arts colleges, one was a graduate degree granting private university, and one was a graduate degree granting public university. A copy of the draft report was sent to the chief academic officer and an appointment for an interview on its contents scheduled two weeks later.

These interviews confirmed the major findings of the study. All academic officers agreed that the faculty opinion at their institutions would parallel the reactions to faculty development, i.e., a low level of enthusiasm where personal adjustments in living or disciplinary re-orientations were involved. Most institutions have some faculty development program activity underway and the degree of activity was related to meeting enrollment declines and area major shifts. All academic officers echoed the general feeling that faculty would be under greater pressure to engage in faculty development and the concept would be expanded in the next five years. One officer suggested that faculty development should also focus on "burnout" which is not addressed in the present report.

Updating and retraining were viewed as more promising approaches than exchange and suggestions were made on how these programs might be implemented and how their institutions would profit from a Board of Higher Education initiative on these two fronts.

All of the academic officers supported the conclusion that the Board of Higher Education needs to exercise leadership in the state to develop an interinstitutional incentives program. One proposal which had support from several interviewees was establishment of centers which would be

located at major institutions featuring updating and retraining in various fields, sciences, computer sciences, business, general education, etc. This would increase program enrollments and provide motivation to develop the curricula that would directly serve faculty and institutional needs.

All academic officers agreed that faculty development, to be successful, must have an interinstitutional thrust. For a number of reasons, retraining or updating faculty within an institution poses special problems for the faculty member and his colleagues. It was felt by several of the academic officers that sending teams of faculty members to participate in a program would enhance acceptance. Also the human and material resources for advanced study in disciplines and new program development are concentrated in separate institutions and will require further fiscal support to develop programs addressed to faculty development. Concentration of resources will produce economy of scale as well as stimulate building programs responsive to need. It was proposed that in order to encourage the interinstitutional thrust, the Board of Higher Education should consider the use of grants to groups of institutions who would work out programs and use the leverage grants to implement the programs.

Where faculty are aware of the necessity for (as in impending reductions in force) and opportunity within exchange, retraining and updating faculty development can proceed without heavy increases in funding. Several examples of programs already underway on a limited scale in several institutions were found in these interviews. In these programs the concept of faculty development was interpreted more broadly to include

brief exchanges for purposes of updating and stimulating institutional exchange of program innovation.

The results of the six interviews validated the original findings and lead the investigators to believe that this study portrays with accuracy the attitudes toward levels of faculty development prevalent among faculty. The results also further documented the status of faculty development in institutions and suggest that the Board of Higher Education can play an important role in aiding institutions to improve their productivity and foster new program options in a time of diminishing resources and a stabilized faculty.

VII. Discussion

These data suggest that there are few constraints or legal structures in institutional policy which would handicap a faculty development program incorporating any or all of the four constructs in this study. Administrators felt any constraints could be surmounted and could be administratively handled as is now done in the individual professional growth construct, sabbatical leave.

All administrators interviewed readily listed surplus and shortage areas by discipline and spoke to the need to manage these problems in a time of budget restraint. Faculty differences were reflected in the responses of those interviewed and those questionnaired with the latter showing a lesser degree of awareness of surpluses and shortages than the faculty interviewed or the administrators. Faculty in this sample reveal very low concern for management of surpluses or shortages and we believe are not aware of the potential for faculty development if a program were arranged among insti-

tutions that would benefit both the individuals and the institutions. As reflected in the literature and in this study, institutions have not explored, in depth, the possible dimensions of programs in faculty development either within the institution or among institutions. We can only conclude that the area is poorly defined, conceptually underdeveloped, and largely neglected in higher education. The chief way of dealing with faculty development appears to be on an individual basis with heavy reliance on individual faculty initiative to seek out professional growth and little attention directed to institutional or individual needs.

Within these data there are a few mismatches on faculty needs between institutions which suggest that a faculty exchange program could be explored and a possible faculty sharing program between the shortage and surplus institutions implemented. However these mismatches are far outpaced by the commonality of areas of shortages and surpluses which suggests that retraining and upgrading of faculty may be a more pressing need if faculty are to be deployed and utilized effectively.

We found an example where a department had not had a new hiring for 15 years and the member interviewed felt strongly a need to bring new life by retraining, upgrading, or exchange. As the enrollment and new faculty hires stabilize, academic departments will experience more difficulty in bringing in new talent to upgrade or develop new program. Where large institutions are involved such as represented in the study some retraining can be done in situ. In the interviews one individual case was cited of a major shift of discipline through retraining. There are constraints to retraining and updating within an institution that are psychologically felt by the

individual faculty member who needs to move into a new field or change disciplinary emphasis.

One senior university's administrators spent time discussing these problems in the interviews. They suggest that participation in faculty development activities (especially retraining and upgrading) receive recognition and be rewarded within a total institutional program which recognizes it as a legitimate group activity pursued through a network of institutions. During retraining and updating other demands on faculty for publication, committee work, teaching could be minimized as the faculty retraining was underway. Also having an organized program would permit building in the guarantees which faculty are requesting that they not be penalized on salary, promotion, and job tenure through participation in faculty development activities. We believe these suggestions merit further exploration and consideration if faculty development is to become a serious effort in the state picture for improved use of higher education resources.

Perhaps the most serious thrust expressed in these data is the lack of faculty enthusiasm for faculty development programs. While investigators see overwhelming evidence of imbalance in faculty resources, shifting demands among disciplinary areas, and radical changes in disciplinary conceptual and methodological demand, faculty are resistant to faculty development to meet these demands -- especially where serious personal adjustment is entailed (as in exchange or retraining). As a facet of human nature widely shared, the resistance to change is understandable. As a response to powerful currents in the society it presents both the institution and the individual with substantive dangers. It is not unknown for society

to shift to other arrangements when the current institutions become unresponsive to economic and social demands. Thus we believe that the issue of faculty development needs to be elevated in the priorities of both administrators and faculty if a program which will strengthen both individuals and institutions is to emerge. The directionless and vague exploratory gestures which characterize the current efforts are not responsive to the pressures that are shaping higher education at this time. We further feel that the lower level of faculty enthusiasms may be due to the unfocused and masked nature of the problems that are addressed through the genre of faculty development. These data suggest a need for a sharper formulation of the issues intra institutionally before a systematic model can be evolved that serves a wide spectrum of faculty and a broad scale range of programs.

VIII. Toward a Model of Faculty Development

A model for faculty development faces formidable obstacles of (1) a socialized professoriate that has fixed attitudes of performance expectations and responsibilities, (2) non existent or weak program planning systems of the responsible academic administrators which are haphazard and short range, (3) lack of development capital and fiscal incentives for program, (4) resistance of traditional structure, e.g., departments and colleges to overall academic planning.

There is limited recognition among the faculty of these institutions, that there is a need for faculty development, and we are persuaded they are fairly representative of U. S. higher education. As assessed against the needs of an institution there is some recognition by faculty of the general desirability for updating staff but the idea that they as individuals might

be retrained to change fields or to modify their current discipline is just not seen as a viable possibility. The area of professional growth receives more support as a faculty development choice than do the other three, but it reflects more the traditional pattern of faculty activity. These findings, therefore, cause us to believe that if economic and programmatic circumstances dictate that there must be movement of faculty among institutions that it will require an extensive awareness and educational program to secure faculty cooperation to bring faculty sharing about.

As the study progressed it was our feeling that we were dealing with issues to which the faculty and administrators had given little thought. We are not surprised at this finding since the economic imperatives that are governing the possibility of needing to shift faculty among institutions are relatively new to the higher education arena and institutions in the past several decades have not had to factor these considerations into their budget planning. There is some evidence that conventional approaches to faculty deployment may change rather drastically. A harbinger of how that change will come about is already visible in a number of institutions in higher education that are perhaps less favorably located for holding current enrollment levels or adjusting to new mixes in enrollment than in the three institutions (all urban located) that figured centrally in this study. In some institutions lack of enrollment has created a surplus of faculty in some areas and simultaneously program demand creates shortages of faculty in others. Opportunities for retraining or updating faculty do not exist within the institutions, hence exchange is an alternative or programs of retraining and updating of tenured faculty in other settings must be sought.

The faculty of higher education in a state where there is a strong coordinating board can be viewed as a single pool of talent that might properly be adjusted by moving faculty among institutions according to surpluses or shortages, or through individual faculties accommodation to demands by expansion of their fields of expertise. The level of positive responses in faculty updating and professional growth holds promise of some openness in faculty to engage in faculty development. These appeals, as institutional objectives, need to be couched in the vocabulary of opportunities and cannot work financial hardship on individuals. Moreover, these need to proceed through a process designed to include the individuals involved early in the planning for these changes rather than waiting for budget strigencies to dictate that there should be faculty exchange or retraining in order to meet economic pressures.

It would appear that the need for exchanges in faculty development might also be influenced directly by size of institutions and location. The three institutions in this pilot study are all large institutions and contain opportunities and/or exist in the context of a large city with easily accessible universities wherein opportunities are available for individuals to do further study or shift their disciplinary emphasis to meet changing demand. Under these circumstances, members can accommodate their own schedules to pursue further scholarly preparation in neighboring institutions. Therefore, it may be that faculty development plans need to be organized among institutions with an idea to giving attention to size and location as well as surpluses and shortages of faculty.

Within these data are hints of resistance to faculty sharing by academic departments. Somewhat hidden in the data, but nonetheless there, is a fear that speaks to the loss of control by departments over personnel. There has been recognition that the jealousy of the departments over control of personnel and program has been a major disincentive to program development that occurs outside of departmental structure or across departmental structures. At a time when institutions may be heavily dependent upon program development as a factor in maintaining their viability against declining budgets and declining enrollments, we believe attention should be given to incentives for enabling an institution to undertake faculty development that would enhance and promote program development in a time of fiscal exigencies. If faculty are to be upgraded or retrained, in order to retain their positions, they will be required to learn to work outside home departmental structures as they master new skills and seek to change fields.

Within the faculty data there is some recognition given to the fact that academic fields are changing rapidly. We see this in faculty gingerly supporting the idea of updating and wishing to engage in this process. Faculty exchange and updating may be avenues to surmount the barrier to program development in departments stemming from inability to hire new faculty.

We believe that crucial to a faculty development program that responds to economic retrenchment and student enrollments decline is the need for administration initiative which will aid faculty in developing an awareness of the need for faculty development as a response to new demands for institutional change. While some evidence of faculty development activity

was found at all institutions, few institutions give consistent attention to the problems, and above all, fewer advance plans that engage faculty members in thinking carefully and critically about the larger social context of higher education and how this will influence their individual contributions. Without concerted attention we believe that changes in faculty and program may be induced by a tide of affairs that is largely out of control of the faculty and administration of an institution. Severe fiscal difficulties may require massive retrenchment of faculty which debilitates programs, whereas a managed program of faculty development involving exchange, retraining, and updating may enable institutions to adjust to severe dislocations and still maintain strength of programs. What would appear to be a depressant upon the future of higher education with some advanced planning and initiative can be converted into an opportunity to effect program improvement in institutions. Capitalizing on this opportunity may be denied if only individualistic and privatistic concerns are the main voices in the planning to respond to grave economic retrenchment and large enrollment declines.

Despite general recognition among faculty of the economic imperatives that currently impede faculty development efforts, faculty appear to be little aware of developmental opportunities beyond those sponsored by their own college or university. Thus, a major finding of this study concerns the need for a multi-institutional program to inform faculty of the need and opportunity for faculty development and exchange.

Although benefits may derive from all four of the processes examined in this study (exchange, updating, retraining, and professional growth), particular mention should be made of "faculty exchange." At a time when

fiscal constraints make program development exceedingly difficult, faculty exchange provides means for short-term use of highly qualified faculty from other institutions to assist with the creation and implementation of new programs in institutions unable to hire tenure track faculty. An institution might construct program, reorganize and retrain faculty over a period of time when the visiting authority was on exchange with them. We found few institutions exercising imagination or foresight in program development which positioned them in meeting new needs. We believe this is a serious administrative deficiency widely shared among institutions.

Upon the completion of the study and the submission of recommendations and proposals to the Board of Higher education to set up a model for faculty sharing among institutions of higher education, concerns emanating from the legislature and Governor's office brought another dimension to the model. A concern for economic development in a stagnating state economy enveloped the Board of Higher Education, and it quickly involved the faculty development request for a renewal grant in the economic revitalization of the state through exploration of joint partnerships of higher education and industry.

Heretofore the model was projected for a sharing of faculty among institutions of higher education, now it was to be expanded to exchange personnel among institutions of higher education, business, industry, government agencies and nonprofit agencies. In FY84 a small grant was awarded to explore personnel sharing, for it was envisioned that personnel would freely move in both directions in the interests particularly of exchange, retraining and upgrading. The model for sharing proposed to establish a brokerage unit that would: (1) identify slots in the five

sectors, (2) identify faculty who would be interested in exchange, (3) do provisional matchups between the slots available and the interested faculty on the basis that there would be reciprocal benefits, (4) work with the available slots and faculty to offset exchanges among several parties and sectors and reduce the problem of trying to complete one to one exchanges. The model project proposed to place nine personnel in exchanges for FY85. In this process the investigators were to explore the nature and type of problems that were encountered in setting up exchanges among these disparate entities. Because the study has been underway since September, we can only report impressions and preliminary finding.

Using professional business organizations, a dozen industries were identified who were believed to have interest in exploring personnel exchanges. Top executive officers were contacted, presented a prospectus on the project, and interviewed on possible slots in their companies or agencies. Table 16 presents a brief description of the organizations and possible slots. A letter was sent to the 33 institutions of higher education who had membership in the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Higher Education to solicit interested faculty and possible slots. From these data banks the investigators were to make provisional matchups for placement. The match ups were designed to provide in-depth experience which would expand the individuals competence and provide a new range of experiences for incorporations in the home institution position. Such was the original design. After six months labor, as Table 16 indicates, a series of potential slots in business, industry, government and non profit agencies, were identified and described. Work has moved to the stage of provisional matchups. As for the

Table 16

Business, Industries, Government Agencies
Potential Exchange

Agency Descriptions	Type of Position
1. Midsized bank in large city minority owned	Middle management training, business systems assistance - would send executive to teach.
2. Major accounting firm, one of big five, large city	No upper level exchanges for faculty, would send to assist higher education institution, in short run (few weeks).
3. Major commercial bank, very large, in large city	Interested in policy analysis type, economist, would exchange executives on short run basis only.
4. Middle size company, 250M a year sales, very rapidly expanding electronics, large city	Would accept only on exchange, too short of personnel due to expansion, quite flexible on type of persons would accept, humanities, social science type.
5. Middle size company, electrical systems for aircraft, farm machinery, middle size city	Very limited possibility, business contracting, very decentralized on decision-making, not able to commit funds or personnel to exchange.
6. Large engineering firm, multi- national, middle size city	Would accept only on exchange, must be high tech oriented with specialization, need own personnel.
7. Large conglomerate, headquarters in large city, large city	Would accept only on exchange, policy sciences type, quantitatively oriented, fiscal orientation also, specific skills needed.
8. Very large utility, large city	Several opportunities in special projects especially ethnic and minority needs. Also, specific technical skills, probably could not send own personnel for any length of time.
9. Non profit agency, large city, services banks, large city	Would be interested in both sending and receiving on an exchange, staff development, curriculum expertise. Would send personnel to assist university program on speciality.
10. Government agency, middle sized city, very large, in state capital	Would receive as well as send in exchange, need qualitative skills, fiscal experience.
11. State agency very large, in rural area	Would receive an exchange but not send, limited possibilities for direct participation counseling and teaching.

model and its refinement some of our preliminary observations and findings are:

1. Industry and business, initially, are more interested in the potential of an exchange system than college faculty. They, however, are much more restrictive on permitting their personnel leaves of any length and are much more interested in bringing in strong academic talent from institutions of higher education to work in their organizations on a temporary basis.
2. Industry and business attitudes vary widely on making arrangements to bring in mature academics into their organizations for in-depth experience. Their attitudes appear to be shaped by two major forces, one exogenous and the other endogenous to the institutions. First the current health of a business is significant, is it expanding under an optimistic business outlook or is it contracting and experiencing an adverse business outlook. Second, the nature of the business colors its attitude toward exchange, is it very narrow, highly technical in its orientation, or is its management characterized by a broader more generalist approach. In the former where its main emphasis is highly technical and it organizes all operations by technical function, academics unless their disciplinary orientation is directly related, are seen as interlopers who will be economic deadweight because of the training requirements placed upon the business to absorb them. Short term exchanges were viewed unfavorably where mature faculty would only be receiving training and would not be able to contribute at the upper levels of management or technical skills.

3. Few institutions of higher education have investigated the use of exchanges for program development, whereby they would bring in an outside faculty member who would assist in developing a program on a short term basis. We found a few instances where business and industry made available on an "on loan" basis personnel for program development, i.e., writing a curriculum in tax law.
4. Exchanges are handicapped where they must proceed on a one to one basis. A large pool of talent facilitates matching up of slots in a variety of institutions and avoids the problem of the exchange institutions having to have complementary personnel to complete an exchange. This finding has been documented in a similar study conducted by the American Bar Association's Lawyer/Teacher Exchange Committee.
5. Progressively managed companies, those who are closer to the excellence in functioning identified by of Peters and Waterman* were more open to exchange than were companies who were very hierarchically operated. Where upper level management were close to the operational functioning and moved easily across divisions and took an integrative view (all efforts were directed toward a few goals) these companies were more flexible in exploring the possibility of creative use of academic talent within their enterprise. One could not predict from a general description of the company and its products, which companies would be enthusiastic about the possibilities in personnel exchange.
6. Universities and colleges tended to be highly inflexible and structurally rigid on decision making -- even more so than the private

* Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman, Jr. In Search of Excellence. Harper and Row, New York, 1982.

industry. It takes enormous amounts of time and paper to float a decision through the administrative bureaucracy. Decision making is very slow, cumbersome and difficult to pin down. There is seemingly an aura of individual faculty autonomy, except that the university is a public utility with a multiplicity of regulators. When a decision is to be made - consult, vote, consult - what isn't stalemated by bureaucratic protectiveness is smothered under participatory-democracy run wild. Decision making seems not to be informed by organization goals, nor organized around the main purposes of research, instruction, and public service. In the final analysis these goals are eclipsed, if they ever were paramount, by the drives of personal self interest. One sees little fusion of personal growth and organizational goals in faculty development decisions, and there is a notable void of administrative leadership in even recognizing the problem and processing a systematic program development effort in conjunction with faculty development activities, logically so apparent, operationally non existent.

7. A few universities and colleges do plan faculty development activities and provide some capital and incentives for faculty. The majority rely exclusively on individual faculty effort and make only minimal investment. They are "on the take" for outside resources to augment their own capital, but are motivated in participation only by the shortest of short term bottom lines--immediate covering of classes, monies for research assistants, etc. The poverty of planning is appalling, the narrowness of vision is endemic and a cult of selfishness is writ large. To be workable, a brokerage system must have at hand capital incentives.

Industries and businesses were understanding and generous, but became understandably nervous when they were always confronted with little reciprocity of investment from institutions of higher education. Without careful planning and specification of outcomes for personnel exchanges we believe there is little chance for them to succeed. At the present time our data suggest that the weaknesses in program planning (long and short range) in higher education is a depressant on utilization of the exchange process to meet faculty development needs. Faculty development proceeding apace as part of a piece in program development would stimulate benefits which would accrue to both the faculty person and the institution of higher education in a time when program development through its normal channels is impeded.